

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 09/879,688 06/12/2001 | | Jae-Yoel Kim | 678-693 (P9800) | 4991 |
| 7590 12/24/2003 | | EXAMINER | | |
| Paul J. Farrell, Esq. | | | TORRES, JOSEPH D | |
| DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP 333 Earle Ovington Blvd. | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Uniondale, NY 11553 | | | 2133 | |

DATE MAILED: 12/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summan | 09/879,688 | KIM ET AL. | | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| The MAN INO DATE of the | Joseph D. Torres | 2133 | | | | | |
| Period for Reply | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Ja | anuary 2003. | | | | | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This | action is non-final. | | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-27 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11. | epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob- | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _ | 5) 🔲 Notice of Informal F | (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | | |

Art Unit: 2133

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-7, 14-18 and 25 drawn to a Frame Encoding Apparatus with using Reed-Muller codes, classified in class 714, subclass 794.
- II. Claims 8, 9, 19 and 20, drawn to a Frame Encoding Apparatus with a Mask Sequence Generator for Creating a Plurality of Mask Sequences, Whose Minimum Distance by a Sum of the Mask Sequences and the Biorthogonal Sequences is at Least 20, classified in class 714, subclass 776.
- III. Claims 10-13 and 21-24, drawn to a Frame Encoding Apparatus with an Orthogonal Sequence Generator for Creating First Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing a Plurality of Base Orthogonal Sequences and a Mask Sequence Generator for Creating Second Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing Base Mask Sequences, classified in class 714, subclass 790.
- IV. Claims 26 and 27, drawn to a Frame Encoding Apparatus with a (48, 10)
 Code Generator for Generating 48 Coded Symbols by Using Length 48
 Codes which are Punctured Codes of Length 64 Walsh Codes, classified in class 370, subclass 209.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Art Unit: 2133

Inventions Group I, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with using Reed-Muller codes, and Group II, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with a Mask Sequence Generator for Creating a Plurality of Mask Sequences, Whose Minimum Distance by a Sum of the Mask Sequences and the Biorthogonal Sequences is at Least 20, are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination, Group I a Frame Encoding Apparatus with using Reed-Muller codes, as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination, Group II a Frame Encoding Apparatus with a Mask Sequence Generator for Creating a Plurality of Mask Sequences, Whose Minimum Distance by a Sum of the Mask Sequences and the Biorthogonal Sequences is at Least 20, as claimed because the combination does not require that the mask sequence generator create mask sequences, whose minimum distance by a sum of the mask sequences and the biorthogonal sequences is at least 20. The subcombination has separate utility such as in frame encoding devices not using Reed-Muller.

Inventions Group I, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with using Reed-Muller codes, and Group III, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with an Orthogonal Sequence Generator for Creating First Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing a Plurality of Base Orthogonal Sequences and a Mask Sequence Generator for Creating Second Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing Base Mask Sequences, are related as

Art Unit: 2133

combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination, Group I a Frame Encoding Apparatus with using Reed-Muller codes, as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination, as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination, Group III a Frame Encoding Apparatus with an Orthogonal Sequence Generator for Creating First Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing a Plurality of Base Orthogonal Sequences and a Mask Sequence Generator for Creating Second Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing Base Mask Sequences, as claimed because the combination does not require that the orthogonal sequence generator create first sequences having a length m by puncturing base orthogonal sequences or the mask sequence generator create second sequences having a length m by puncturing base mask sequences. The subcombination has separate utility such as in frame encoding devices not using Reed-Muller.

Inventions Group I, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with using Reed-Muller codes, and Group IV, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with a (48, 10) Code Generator for Generating 48 Coded Symbols by Using Length 48 Codes which are Punctured Codes of Length 64 Walsh Codes, are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP §

Art Unit: 2133

806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination, Group I a Frame Encoding Apparatus with using Reed-Muller codes, as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination, Group IV a Frame Encoding Apparatus with a (48, 10) Code Generator for Generating 48 Coded Symbols by Using Length 48 Codes which are Punctured Codes of Length 64 Walsh Codes, as claimed because the combination does not require a (48, 10) code generator for generating 48 coded symbols by using length 48 codes which are punctured codes of length 64 Walsh codes. The subcombination has separate utility such as in frame encoding devices not using Reed-Muller.

Inventions Group II, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with a Mask Sequence
Generator for Creating a Plurality of Mask Sequences, Whose Minimum Distance by a
Sum of the Mask Sequences and the Biorthogonal Sequences is at Least 20, and
Group III, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with an Orthogonal Sequence Generator for
Creating First Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing a Plurality of Base
Orthogonal Sequences and a Mask Sequence Generator for Creating Second
Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing Base Mask Sequences, are related as
subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The
subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable.
In the instant case, invention Group II, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with a Mask
Sequence Generator for Creating a Plurality of Mask Sequences, Whose Minimum
Distance by a Sum of the Mask Sequences and the Biorthogonal Sequences is at Least
20, has separate utility such as in a frame encoding device with a mask sequence
generator for creating a plurality of mask sequences, whose minimum distance by a

Art Unit: 2133

sum of the mask sequences and the biorthogonal sequences is at least 20. In the instant case, invention Group III, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with an Orthogonal Sequence Generator for Creating First Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing a Plurality of Base Orthogonal Sequences and a Mask Sequence Generator for Creating Second Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing Base Mask Sequences, has separate utility such as in a frame decoding device with an orthogonal sequence generator for creating first sequences having a length m by puncturing a plurality of base orthogonal sequence and a mask sequence generator for creating second sequences having a length m by puncturing base mask sequences. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions Group II, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with a Mask Sequence
Generator for Creating a Plurality of Mask Sequences, Whose Minimum Distance by a
Sum of the Mask Sequences and the Biorthogonal Sequences is at Least 20, and
Group IV, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with a (48, 10) Code Generator for Generating
48 Coded Symbols by Using Length 48 Codes which are Punctured Codes of Length 64
Walsh Codes, are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single
combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be
separately usable. In the instant case, invention Group II, a Frame Encoding Apparatus
with a Mask Sequence Generator for Creating a Plurality of Mask Sequences, Whose
Minimum Distance by a Sum of the Mask Sequences and the Biorthogonal Sequences
is at Least 20, has separate utility such as in a frame encoding device with a mask
sequence generator for creating a plurality of mask sequences, whose minimum

Art Unit: 2133

distance by a sum of the mask sequences and the biorthogonal sequences is at least 20. In the instant case, invention Group IV, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with a (48, 10) Code Generator for Generating 48 Coded Symbols by Using Length 48 Codes which are Punctured Codes of Length 64 Walsh Codes, has separate utility such as in a frame encoding device with a (48, 10) code generator for generating 48 coded symbols by using length 48 codes which are punctured codes of length 64 Walsh codes. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions Group III, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with an Orthogonal Sequence Generator for Creating First Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing a Plurality of Base Orthogonal Sequences and a Mask Sequence Generator for Creating Second Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing Base Mask Sequences, and Group IV, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with a (48, 10) Code Generator for Generating 48 Coded Symbols by Using Length 48 Codes which are Punctured Codes of Length 64 Walsh Codes, are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination, Group III, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with an Orthogonal Sequence Generator for Creating First Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing a Plurality of Base Orthogonal Sequences and a Mask Sequence Generator for Creating Second Sequences having a Length M by Puncturing Base Mask Sequences, as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination, Group



Art Unit: 2133

IV, a Frame Encoding Apparatus with a (48, 10) Code Generator for Generating 48
Coded Symbols by Using Length 48 Codes which are Punctured Codes of Length 64
Walsh Codes, as claimed because the combination does not require a (48, 10) code
generator for generating 48 coded symbols by using length 48 codes which are
punctured codes of length 64 Walsh codes. The subcombination has separate utility
such as in a frame encoding device using a (48, 10) code generator for generating 48
coded symbols by using length 48 codes which are punctured codes of length 64 Walsh
codes not requiring an orthogonal sequence generator for creating first sequences
having a length m by puncturing a plurality of base orthogonal sequences nor a mask
sequence generator for creating second sequences having a length m by puncturing
base mask sequences.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II and vice versa, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group III and vice versa, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 2133

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group IV and vice versa, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group II is not required for Group III and vice versa, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group II is not required for Group IV and vice versa, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group III is not required for Group IV and vice versa, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Paul J. Farell on 19 December 2003 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph D. Torres whose telephone number is (703) 308-7066. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (703) 305-9595. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding/should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-

746-7240

Joșeph D. Torre≰, PhD

/Art/Unit 2133

| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary Og/679,688 KIM ET AL. Examiner | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|---|---|--|
| All Participants: (1) Joseph D. Torres (2) Paul J. Farell. (3) | | 09/879,688 | KIM ET AL. |
| All Participants: Status of Application: New Case (1) Joseph D. Torres. (2) Paul J. Farell. (4) Date of Interview: 19 December 2003 Time: 2:00pm Type of Interview: Telephonic | Examiner-initiated interview Summary | Examiner | Art Unit |
| (1) Joseph D. Torres. (2) Paul J. Farell. (4) Date of Interview: 19 December 2003 Time: 2.00pm Type of interview: 2 Telephonic | | Joseph D. Torres | 2133 |
| California Cal | All Participants: | Status of Application: Ne | w Case |
| Date of Interview: 19 December 2003 Type of Interview: Telephonic Telephonic Telephonic Applicant Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes If Yes, provide a brief description: N/A. Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: N/A Claims discussed: N/A Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Attorney declined to elect over the phone. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the Allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview and the interview of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | (1) <u>Joseph D. Torres</u> . | (3) | |
| Type of Interview: Telephonic Tydeo Conference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description: N/A. Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: N/A Prior art documents discussed: N/A Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Attorney declined to elect over the phone. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview directly resulted in the Rotice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the Rotice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | (2) <u>Paul J. Farell</u> . | (4) | |
| Telephonic dide Conference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative) State Conference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative) State Conference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative) State Conference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant's representative) Part I. | Date of Interview: 19 December 2003 | Time: <u>2:00pm</u> | |
| Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: N/A Claims discussed: N/A Prior art documents discussed: N/A Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Attorney declined to elect over the phone. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | ☐ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applica | nt's representative) | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: N/A Claims discussed: N/A Prior art documents discussed: N/A Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Attorney declined to elect over the phone. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | If Yes, provide a brief description: N/A. | | |
| Claims discussed: N/A Prior art documents discussed: N/A Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Attorney declined to elect over the phone. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | Part I. | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: N/A Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Attorney declined to elect over the phone. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | • | | |
| Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Attorney declined to elect over the phone. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Attorney declined to elect over the phone. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | | |
| Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | Part II. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS | B DISCUSSED: |
| directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | Part III. | | |
| (Examiner(SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Personantative Signature of approximately | directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate re- | examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the | en summary of the substance interview, since the interview |
| (Examiner SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Ponsocontative Signature, if appropriate) | | | |
| (Evaluation of Eliginature) (Additionally Addition is redresentative dignature — it additionally | (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant) | Applicant's Representative Si | gnature – if appropriate) |